

## Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting

Thursday, June 8, 2000  
8:30 A.M. — 5:00 P.M.  
Chase Palm Park Center  
236 E. Cabrillo Blvd. Santa Barbara, California

### Draft Meeting Summary

---

#### In Attendance:

Dave Parker, Co-Chair (alt. for Patty Wolf)  
Sean Hastings, Co-Chair (alt. for Matt Pickett)  
Locky Brown  
Gary Davis  
Robert Fletcher  
Dr. Craig Fusaro  
Dale Glantz  
Neil Guglielmo  
Greg Helms (alt. for Warner Chabot)  
Mark Helvey  
Deborah McArdle  
Chris Miller  
Tom Raftican

Steve Roberson  
Dr. Michael McGinnis  
Bruce Steele (alt. for Marla Daily)  
Alicia Stratton

John Jostes, Facilitator

Staff from CINMS: Dr. Satie Airame, Mettja  
Hong, Mike Murray, and Ben Waltenberger

Members of the public

( alt. designates alternate for primary working  
group member)

- Welcome and Introductions:** The meeting opened up with introductions from Dave Parker and Sean Hastings, both of whom were representing the MRWG s co-chairs. Dave read a message from Patty, thanking the MRWG for their hard work. She also conveyed to the MRWG that the Department of Fish and Game is committed to seeing this process through.
- Adoption of Meeting Summary from April 13, 2000 Working Group Meeting:** John Jostes led the group in a review of the April meeting summary. The following changes were noted and the summary accepted:
  - Re: pg. 1, Item 4(A), the last sentence of the first paragraph should read, Resolution of the meeting dates and times was deferred to later in the meeting (see Item 9A below).
  - Re: pg. 7, Kate Faulker s final comment, emit strictly from the last sentence.
- Review Agenda and Process Overview:** John Jostes gave a brief overview of the MRWG process. The Science Panel (SP) had two meetings since the MRWG last met. During those meetings, the SP worked on the MRWG s goals and objectives. John reported that he is currently making a rough draft of a table of contents for the next few MRWG meetings. He encourages the evolution of working relationships, but is concerned with meeting attendance and the forgetfulness of ground rules. John distributed a document entitled, Process Challenges Typically Faced at Mid-Term in Consensus-Based Processes.

Sean gave a brief summary of the President s recent Executive Order on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). He reported that the President asked both the Department of Commerce and Department of Interior to address MPAs over the long term and work collaboratively. The President also asked NOAA to develop a committee on MPAs.

Tom Raftican who attended a recent SAC workshop on Boundary Concepts raised the issue of CINMS boundary expansion and indicated he was very concerned about negotiating in the context of changing assumptions. He expressed frustration that he wasn t included in possible boundary expansion discussions. Sean emphasized that the Sanctuary staff had communicated to the MRWG the Management Plan revision process since the beginning. He apologized for the confusion and clarified that both the MRWG and the Science Panel will only focus on existing boundaries. Sean also noted that there is no preferred boundary alternative at this time. The preferred alternative will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) at the end of the summer. The reserve recommendation is also part of the Management Plan, but because the MRWG process will not be completed by the end of the summer, CINMS will put a placeholder in the Management Plan for the MRWG recommendation.

Several fishing representatives also expressed concern with boundary expansion regarding their constituencies and the MRWG's credibility. Sean emphasized that the Sanctuary does not regulate fisheries. Bob Fletcher believes that the MRWG sometimes gets too insulated and forgets that other agencies have the power to establish reserves. In addition, Bruce Steele (alternate for Marla Daily) noted that negotiating for a recommendation regarding marine reserves at the same time the Sanctuary is proposing an expansion of its jurisdictional area places him in the awkward position of strongly opposing the Sanctuary in one forum and supporting it (via the Marine Reserves process) in another. He indicated that this conflict made it difficult for him to constructively represent his constituency in the MRWG process.

John Jostes suggested that the MRWG may wish to limit the application of its consensus recommendation to address current assumptions regarding Sanctuary Boundaries, or explore other alternatives that provide a level of comfort with the implications of boundary issues on consensus over a recommendation for marine reserves. Chris Miller suggested that individual MRWG members should consider joining task groups that meet outside (i.e., between) regular MRWG meetings to develop supplementary concepts for MRWG consideration at its regular meetings. He also expressed concern that the expansion plan is taking away from the MRWG's capacity to develop a recommendation and that the public needs more avenues for their input in this process.

#### **4. Update on Science Panel Progress:**

**(A) Summary of Science Panel Meetings:** Satie Airame reported that the Science Panel met on May 4<sup>th</sup>. They reviewed the MRWG's Goals and Objectives, reviewed the Species of Interest list, and made a draft Habitat Classification list. A Science Panel subgroup also met on May 25<sup>th</sup> and discussed ecological criteria. She reported that the Science Panel will not be able to meet the initial timeline for presenting goal oriented options to the MRWG by July 18<sup>th</sup>; however, several members expressed an interest in attending and participating in the July 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting. The current schedule is for the Science Panel to provide their input on goal oriented options in time for consideration at the MRWG's August 22-23 meeting. The Science Panel is focussing on two goals for reserve design, ecosystem biodiversity and sustainable fisheries, and one goal for reserve administration, research.

Discussion regarding the creation of reserve options ensued. Bruce Steele suggested that it might be advantageous for the MRWG to create reserve options at the same time the Science Panel is, enabling each group to funnel things through one another. Chris Miller added that the MRWG needs to have direct interactions with the Science Panel to facilitate communication between both groups. Deborah McArdle understood the temptation to draw lines, but stated that this process was set up this way to maintain objectivity and create a transparent process. Dave Parker maintained that the MRWG agreed that the primary objective of a reserve should be its ecological function. After options are created based on its ecological function, it can then be filtered. Chris believes that the MRWG should utilize information from NCEAS. Satie asked Chris to review what the Science Panel has done first. She stated that many of the same theoretical models that NCEAS used have been reviewed and utilized by the Science Panel. There was no consensus among the group regarding the degree to which the MRWG should utilize these models.

#### **(B) MRWG Adoption of Edits to Goals and Objectives:**

Sean Hastings distributed a revised copy of the Goals and Objectives with edits made by the Science Panel. Satie emphasized that the Science Panel could not move forward until the MRWG approves the sustainable fisheries and ecosystem biodiversity goals. Chris Miller mentioned that he had written a new set of goals and objectives, along with a problem statement with Craig Barilotti that he feels comfortable taking to his constituents. Most of the MRWG agreed that a problem statement was useful. John Jostes noted that some MRWG members had not had an opportunity to review the proposed problem statement and asked the MRWG to e-mail any comments regarding the problem statement ASAP. He noted that upon receipt of those comments, he would attempt to craft a revision that was capable of receiving a consensus of the group so that progress could be made.

Regarding the Goals and Objectives, Sanctuary staff and the Facilitator reviewed the refinements suggested by the Science Panel and asked the MRWG as a whole to attempt closure on those goals and objectives that were prerequisites to further progress by the Science Panel. After much discussion, the following suggestions/edits to the Draft Goals and Objectives were adopted by a full consensus of those present. Note: The full text of the adopted goals and objectives is presented below to capture the extent of agreement. The language noted below reflects the MRWG's understanding that an affirmative vote in favor of these goals and objectives meant that they would be transmitted to the Science Panel as "Approved by a Consensus of the MRWG" and revisions to

wording would not be considered until a complete and full draft of the Recommendation was presented to the MRWG for final review and ratification. Attached at the end of this summary are the Goals and Objectives that were approved by MRWG Consensus on June 8, 2000.

### **Goals for Marine Reserves**

#### **Natural and Cultural Heritage**

- To provide and set aside areas for visitor, spiritual, and recreational opportunities which include cultural and ecological features and their associated values.

### **Objectives for Reserve Design**

#### *Ecosystem Biodiversity*

- To protect representative marine habitats, ecological processes, and populations of interest.
- ~~To protect functional groups of species.~~
- To set aside areas which provide biochemical, physical, and biological functions.

### **Objectives for Reserve Monitoring and Evaluation**

#### *Research*

- To evaluate short- and long-term differences between ~~natural~~ reserve and ~~utilized~~ non-reserve areas.

#### *Sustainable Harvested Populations*

- To establish long-term ~~fish~~ monitoring programs in, adjacent to, and distant from reserves.
- To study and evaluate the effects of predators on ~~fishery~~ marine resources in, adjacent to and distant from reserves.

### **Objectives for Reserve Administration**

#### *Enforcement*

- Provide guidelines for transit and transport anchoring
- Have a consistent application of regulations

Regarding the issue of reserve monitoring, Craig Fusaro mentioned that he was disappointed that the Science Panel does not want to participate in reserve monitoring. Satie conveyed that the Science Panel felt that if they were tasked to evaluate something that they helped develop, they would be biased. She added that individual scientists from the Panel would probably want to participate in the monitoring, but not the entire Science Panel as a unit.

Following the MRWG's adoption of the Goals and Objectives for 1. Ecosystem Biodiversity, 2. Sustainable Harvested Populations, and 3. Research, a discussion ensued regarding the importance of funding for reserves. Mark Helvey and Sean Hastings explained that the Sanctuary is on an annual funding cycle and therefore, it is difficult to determine what their budget would be in the future.

**(C) Update on Populations of Interest List:** Satie Airame reported that the Science Panel must have data that is biologically meaningful. The Science Panel recommended a subdivision of habitat based on classifications. She noted that kelp was not placed on the classification list because it fluctuates over time and also because it would be captured by other habitats.

**(D) Discussion on Habitat Characterization modeling:** Gary Davis mentioned that he would feel more comfortable if kelp was included as a habitat because in some areas over long periods of time, kelp is a fixed and permanent feature. Dale Glantz noted that he had originally recommended that kelp be included and agreed with Gary that it should be included. A discussion about the three biogeographic zones in the Santa Barbara Channel followed. Satie emphasized that there is a continuous transition zone with southern species dropping out as you move north of the transition zone and northern species dropping out as you move south of the transition zone. She suggested that the MRWG send any comments regarding habitat characterization via e-mail. Satie also added that she is still in the process of collecting data.

5. **Summary of the Status of Resources Report:** Alice Green of Tetra Tech began with a brief overview of the CINMS Management Plan revision process, the purpose of the Status of Resources Report, and the approach used in collecting the data for the report. Satie, John Ugoretz, and Alice then presented a summary of the major findings from the report for the following species:

Giant kelp

- Greatly reduced since 1980
- Cooler waters and lower sea urchin densities allow kelp forests to regenerate

Phytoplankton

- Higher in Study Area
- Jan. — Mar.: greatest abundance
- Great impact from El Nino in 1983-1984 and populations haven't fully recovered since then

Zooplankton

- Declining by 80% from 1951 levels

Rock scallop

- No significant trends

Red rock crab

- Decline

Spiny lobster

- No significant trends
- Commercial landings show an increase

Red urchin

- Present, common, and abundant in the Channel Islands
- Abundance hasn't changed much, but the size of the urchins has gotten smaller
- Landings data show a decline

Purple urchin

- Large fluctuations in densities over time and space
- Populations in the north are level
- Populations in the south are higher
- Stable populations at reserve sites

Giant-spined sea star

- Variable
- Sharp drop in 1995 from increased water temperature

California sea cucumber

- Common in the Channel Islands, with large fluctuations in population densities over space and time

Warty sea cucumber

- Variable

Market squid

- Variable, market effects harvest

- Declines during El Nino events

California hydrocoral

- Rare species
- Known only from a few deep, current-swept reefs at Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and San Miguel Islands
- Recent densities are similar to those in 1983

Brown gorgonian

- Rare species
- Decline

Red gorgonian

- Rare species
- Decline

Green abalone

- Decline possibly from withering syndrome
- Now rare or absent

Black abalone

- Decline from withering syndrome
- Levels near zero
- Slightly higher populations near San Miguel Island

Pink abalone

- Decline possibly from withering syndrome

Red abalone

- No significant change
- Present at Santa Rosa and San Miguel Island

Rockfish

- Commercial landings show a decline

Brown pelican

- Upward trend in populations

Snowy plover

- Decline primarily from wind and ravens

California least tern

- Increase

California sea lion

- Decline during El Nino events

Northern fur seal

- Threatened

Northern elephant seal

- Decline during El Nino events

6. **MRWG Comments on and Review of the Status of Resources Presentation:** Several MRWG members expressed concern over the use of landings data in the Status of Resources Report, stating that fish landings do not account for the impacts of El Ninos, fishing strategies, or regulations on fish populations. Bruce Steele

added that he felt that Tetra Tech drew conclusions regarding urchin-kelp interactions in the Affected Environment section of the DEIS. Gary reminded the MRWG that this data has not been analyzed yet.

7. **Update on Existing Marine Protected Areas within Sanctuary Boundaries:** Deborah McArdle provided the MRWG with an overview of existing Marine Protected Areas in the Sanctuary including the following points and perspectives. For more detailed information, refer to Deborah McArdle's book entitled, *California Marine Protected Areas*.

Channel Islands Biosphere Reserve

- Objective: Foster good relationships between humans and the biosphere
- No regulations

Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary

- No fishing regulations
- Regulations on discharge and seabed disturbance

Channel Islands National Park

- Limit on the take of certain invertebrates from the Park

Santa Barbara Channel Ecological Reserve

- Areas of special biological significance

- Created to prevent negative impacts on water quality

Ecological Reserves

Anacapa Island

- Closure 1 mile around island

San Miguel Island

- No fishing at certain times of the year

Santa Barbara Island

- No nets, traps or invertebrates taken at 20 ft. zone

Vandenberg Marine Resources Protection Act

Ecological Reserve

- 2 square miles

8. **Constituent Outreach:** The following members provided input on their constituent outreach efforts:

Bob Fletcher (PFMC): Announced that there is a Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) Board of Directors meeting coming up and asked the MRWG if they wanted to get involved. He noted that sportfishing catch data at Santa Barbara Island might have been left out of the data collection efforts. He also announced that he has been receiving questions about a possible public forum on reserves from his constituents. He reported that there has been three major developments: 1) The development of a rebuilding plan for Cal Cod to be completed by the end of this year, 2) An ad hoc MRWG met last week and will recommend to the PFMC to go to Phase 2 and begin siting reserves, and 3) An ad hoc committee on the strategic planning for the future of groundfish met and has recommended that marine reserves be used as a management tool. He also noted that the PFMC was considering marine reserves for Cow Cod by the end of the year 2000. The ad hoc committee studied overfished stocks and established that if a stock declines to 25% of its unfished biomass, it will be considered overfished.

Greg Helms (CMC): Trying to get his constituents involved in both the MRWG and Management Plan process. Believes that it is a good idea to have a collaborative process. CMC, along with other conservation groups will be hosting a weekend workshop in July called, *The Mountains to the Sea: Making the Connection*.

Alicia Stratton: Attended several Surfrider meetings, but most of her constituents do not want to participate until things start happening.

Deborah McArdle: Attended a meeting on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Canada. Mentioned that the Commission for Environmental Cooperation is getting a network to talk about MPAs. Met with IOCN in D.C. and discussed the MRWG process. She also reported that Sea Grant had a meeting about outreach where Sean Hastings and Ben Waltenberger participated and presented. Sea Grant is also hiring a post-doc that might be able to help out with this process.

Paul Reilly: Currently in the early stages of Master Plan for Marine Protected Areas. They currently have eight scientists discussing the mandates of A3993 implementing the bill and evaluating existing MPAs. He noted that he would provide a full report at the next meeting later in June.

9. **Next Steps:** John Jostes led the discussion on this topic. He reported that he is working on an annotated table of contents of what the MRWG has done and what the MRWG will do in the future. Asked those interested in joining the enforcement, public and constituent outreach, or implementation subcommittees to let him know. John requested that everyone on the MRWG write a sentence about the implications of non-agreement.

**Final Comments:**

John Jostes augmented the participants comments about constituent outreach with several requests. He requested that members review Chris Miller's problem statement and provide responses back to him no later than Thursday, June 15<sup>th</sup>. In addition, he requested that individuals give consideration to the implications of non agreement of the group on a recommendation to the SAC, with particular attention being paid to whether their specific constituent groups would be better off or worse off if agreement was not achieved. Finally, he asked that individuals provide him with their preferences to serve on three subcommittees - Enforcement, Constituent Outreach, and Implementation. He suggested that which ever subcommittees attracted the interest of the MRWG would be convened between regular meetings at a time convenient to its members.

Prior to adjourning the meeting, Facilitator John Jostes asked those present to reflect on the accomplishments of the day, and share the perspectives they would take back to their constituencies and, for alternates, to the MRWG members they were representing.

Craig Fusaro: Pleased that the Science Panel is moving forward.

Bruce Steele: Pleased that nobody on the MRWG is taking low blows. He wishes the Press would work better at getting the facts straight.

Chris Miller: Asked if the MRWG will accept the NCEAS model. Satie then gave a summary of the criteria that the Science Panel will be using. She will make a handout of the criteria for the June 22<sup>nd</sup> MRWG meeting. Satie also reported that the Science Panel is currently using a computer algorithm model for evaluating the criteria and generating a variety of reserve scenarios.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**

**Summary of Action Items:**

1. E-mail or fax comments on the Reserves Problem Statement to John by Thursday, June 15.
2. E-mail comments regarding habitat characterization to Satie.
3. Revised and adopted Goals and Objectives related to Ecosystem Biodiversity, Sustainable Harvested Populations and Research.
4. Write a sentence about the implications of non-agreement for individual constituencies.
5. Sign up for subcommittees.

**Future MRWG Meeting Dates:**

June 22;  
July 18;  
August 22-23;  
September 26;  
October 18, and;  
November 16.

**MRWG APPROVED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**  
**June 2000**

**Ecosystem Biodiversity**

**To protect representative and unique marine habitats, ecological processes, and populations of interest.**

**Objectives -**

1. To include representative marine habitats, ecological processes, and populations of interest.
2. To identify and protect multiple levels of diversity (e.g. species, habitats, representations from biogeographic provinces, trophic structure).
3. To provide a buffer for species of interest against the impacts of environmental fluctuations.
4. To identify and incorporate representative and unique marine habitats.
5. To set aside areas which provide physical, biological, and chemical functions.
6. To enhance long-term biological productivity.
7. To minimize short-term loss of biological productivity.
8. To develop methods for evaluating ecosystem integrity.

**Sustainable Harvested Populations:**

**To provide a buffer against impacts of environmental fluctuations on commercial and recreationally important species.**

**Objectives -**

1. To facilitate recovery and sustainability of harvested populations.
2. To enhance spillover into non-reserve areas.
3. To establish long-term monitoring programs in, adjacent to, and distant from reserves.
4. To monitor impacts of reserves on commercial and recreational industries.
5. To document changes of catch characteristics of users adjacent to and distant from reserves.
6. To study and evaluate the effects of predators on marine populations in, adjacent to and distant from reserves.
7. To evaluate the effectiveness of reserves as a tool in the context of integrated fishery management.
8. To develop an adaptive management design for reserves as an experimental fishery management tool.
9. To assess the short- and long-term effectiveness of reserves as an experimental fishery management tool.

**Research**

1. **To monitor ecosystem functions and acquire baseline data to assess natural and human impacts between reserve and other areas; and**
2. **To evaluate the short- and long-term effectiveness of reserves as resource and fishery management tools.**

**Objectives -**

1. To design reserves that will be tractable for monitoring of biological and physical processes.
2. To develop a monitoring and evaluation program that will provide enough information for adaptive management.
3. To establish long-term monitoring of ecological patterns and processes in, adjacent to, and distant from marine reserves.
4. To establish areas for systematic study of nearshore marine species, including (1) larval export, (2) adult migration, (3) relative abundances, (4) size-frequency distributions, and (5) other topics of interest.
5. To evaluate short- and long-term differences between reserve and non-reserve areas.
6. To provide long-term continuity in effort, expertise, and funding during reserve monitoring and evaluation.